



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/830,178	04/20/2004	Ching Hsiang Lee	AFX16	7720
7590 Ching Hsiang Lee P.O. Box 4-67 Hsin Chuang Taipei, 242 TAIWAN		03/30/2007	EXAMINER HO, HUY C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER 2617
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/30/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/830,178	LEE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Huy C. Ho	2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 April 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. **Claims 1-4** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Dorenbosch et al. (2002/0118663)** and further in view of **Lewis et al. (2004/0116119)**.

Consider claim 1, Dorenbosch teaches a wireless router device (see the abstract), comprising:

a processor unit (figure 1),

Dorenbosch does not clearly teach a wireless transmission circuit coupled to said processor unit, for transmitting wireless signals to and from said processor unit, and for communicating with various network systems, however, Dorenbosch shows transceivers being used for communicating with wireless packet data channel and LAN/WLAN (the abstract, pars [8]-[9], [13], [16]). In an analogous art, Lewis teaches a wireless transmission circuit coupled to said processor unit, for transmitting wireless signals to and from said processor unit, and for communicating with various network systems (figures 3, 6, pars [9], [12], [14]-[18], [55], [76], [79]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify and incorporate Lewis teachings into Dorenbosch invention in order to have the feature of a wireless transmission circuit coupled to said processor unit, for transmitting wireless signals to and from said processor unit, and for communicating with various network systems.

Dorenbosch, modified by Lewis, further teaches:

a coupler coupled to said processor unit (figure 1, pars [9]),

a telecommunication card for selectively coupling to said coupler to allow wireless transmission or telecommunication signals to be transmitted between said processor unit and a telecommunication station (fig 2, pars [16]-[17]),

a network device coupled to said processor unit, for communicating said processor unit with end users ([8], [16]-[17]), and

said wireless transmission circuit and said coupler and said network device being communicatable with each other via said processor unit, to allow end users to couple and share information from the network systems and the telecommunication station (**figure 3, pars [17]**).

Consider claim 2, The wireless router device as claimed in **claim 1**, Dorenbosch, modified by Lewis, further teaches an antenna coupled to said wireless transmission circuit, for communicating said processor unit with the network systems (**figure 3, pars [13], [16]-[17]**).

Consider claim 3, The wireless router device as claimed in **claim 1**, Dorenbosch, modified by Lewis, teaches wherein said network device includes a plurality of couplers for communicating with various end users (**pars [9], [12], [14]-[18], [55], [76], [79]**).

Consider claim 4, The wireless router device as claimed in **claim 1**, Dorenbosch, modified by Lewis, teaches a second network device coupled to said processor unit, for communicating said processor unit with various network systems (**pars [9], [12], [14]-[18], [55], [76], [79]**).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huy C. Ho whose telephone number is (571) 270-1108. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick Corsaro can be reached on (571) 272-7876. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



NICK CORSARO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600